UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,769	03/31/2001	Anil K. Annadata	SBL0003US	6443

60975   7590   03/28/2008
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
REFAI, RAMSEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/823,769	ANNADATA ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	RAMSEY REFAI	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 February 2008</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2,5-21,24-34 and 37-60</u> is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2,5-21,24-34 and 37-60</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed February 11, 2008. Claims 2, 15, 21, 34,

and 49 have been amended. Claims 2, 5-21, 24-34, and 37-60 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance:

  Argument A: *Dilip et al fail to teach a web browser-based media-independent user interface*

  comprising a first user interface object configured to provide a notification of the event received from

  the communication channel.

  In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Dilip et al teach an agent uses a computer system

to receive a transaction of any type as soon as they are available and as soon as the agent is able to

receive a transaction **(see column 2, lines 24-31, column 5, lines 3-34; notification is inherent in order to**

notify agent of an incoming transaction).).

  Argument B: *Dilip fails to provide a disclosure of a common communication application program*

  interface. Dilip fails to provide a single communication interface around which channel drivers can be

  configured.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Dilip et al teach communicating with a plurality

of different transaction types. Column 8, lines 16-33 teach an interface controller that controls the

transaction processing system's interface and other interfaces for handling the transactions. Drivers are

inherently used. The use of a common application program interface is also inherently used since the

transaction controller must relay data between multiple media types and the transaction processing

system.

Specification

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because undue length. Correction is required. See

MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for

the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),
by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a
patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty
defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application
filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and
was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
was made.

4.   Claims 2, 5-21, 24-34, and 37-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the

alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Dilip et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,409).

5.   As per claim 2, Dilip et al teach an apparatus for communicating using a communication channel

comprising:

a configurable communication server **(Figure 2; transaction controller)** configured to

communicate, in a media-independent manner **(column 6, lines 8-48, column 3, lines 25-28; the**

transaction controller handles multiple types of transactions) via one or more media specific

communication channel **(figure 2, transaction processing system can handle specific transaction such as**

telephone, email, etc, column 6, lines 10-28) using a corresponding channel drivers associated with each

communication channel, wherein the communication server is configured to communicate independently

of a media type of a corresponding communication channel, and each channel driver is configured

according to a common communication application program interface for communication with the

communication server and the channel driver in said media-independent manner **(column 8, lines 16-33;**

an interface controller that controls the transaction processing system' s interface and other interfaces

for handling the transactions. Drivers are inherently used. The use of a common application program

interface is also inherently used since the transaction controller must relay data between multiple media

types and the transaction processing system) by virtue of being configured to access information

regarding a type of communication that uses the communication channel **(Fig 5 element 130 – 134,**

column 9, lines 23-54, column 8, lines 35-59; determine type of transaction and how to handle the

transaction), determine a command to issue to the communication channel to cause an outgoing

communication to be sent if the type of communication is outgoing **(column 4, lines 5-54; transactions can**

be inbound or outbound).; and determine an event response to perform in response to an event if the type

of communication is incoming**(column 3, lines 25-52, fig 4 element 104, 112; communicates incoming**

transaction to appropriate system) wherein the information is accessed from a memory storing data

corresponding to a configuration of the communication channel **(column 8, lines 35-57; inference engine**

analyzes transaction to determine how and where to route the transaction) and

      a web browser-based media-independent user interface **(column 2, lines 29-31, column 5, lines**

6-21; agent can receive transactions of any type) comprising a first user interface object configured to

provide a notification of the event received from the communication channel **(notification is inherent in**

order to notify agent of an incoming transaction).

However, in the event that the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner regarding the inherency of

the limitations " each channel driver is configured according to a common communication application

program interface", and " a first user interface object configured to provide a notification of the event

received from the communication channel" , the Examiner asserts that these feature are obvious.

Dilip et al teach communicating with a plurality of different transaction types but fails to teach

each channel driver is configured according to a common communication application program interface.

However, it would have been obvious to include channel drivers configured according to a common

communication API because doing so would allow for the communication server and other

programs/devices to communicate with the system using a common interface.

Dilip et al teach that an agent can communicate with any type of interaction using a computer and

a telephone, which can be integrated into the computer **(see column 5, lines 5-21)** but fails to teach the

interface includes a first user interface object configured to provide a notification of the event received

from the communication channel. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to include this feature in Dilip et al because doing so would allow the user interface to notify the agent of

an incoming transaction needing attention.

6.   As per claim 5, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising:

         a database comprising an event record, wherein the event record comprises the information

regarding the event (column 6, lines 43-48, column 5, lines 35-44; database stores data regarding

transactions handles in system,).

7.   As per claim 6, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is

configured by performing one of adding the event record to the database, modifying the event record in

the database, and deleting the event record from the database (column 6, lines 43-58, column 8, lines 61-

67, column 5, lines 35-44).

8.   As per claim 7, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: at least one event handler and wherein

the event record comprises a name of one event handler of the at least one event handler for handling

the event and the configurable communication server uses the one event handler named in the event

record for handling the event (Figure 2, column 3, lines 48-67, column 9, lines 23-67).

9.   As per claim 8, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the database further comprises an event

response record associated with the event record; and the configurable communication server is further

configured to determining the event response by accessing the event response record associated with the

event record **(column 5, lines 35–44, column 9, lines 23-67)**.

10.   As per claim 9, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the information regarding the event further

comprises information regarding the event response; and the configurable communication server is

further configured to perform the event response **(Figure 2, column 3, lines 48-67, column 9, lines 23-67)**.

11.   As per claim 10, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is

coupled to a channel driver such that the channel driver communicates with the communication channel

**(Figure 2; the use of drivers are well known in the art and are inherent when using multiple

communication channels that each use different protocols. The use of drivers would free the operating

system from the burden of having to understand and support the needs of individual channels)**.

12.   As per claim 11, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is

coupled to the channel driver such that the configurable communication server receives the event from

the communication channel via the channel driver **(Figure 2; the use of drivers are well known in the art

and are inherent when using multiple communication channels that each use different protocols. The use**

of drivers would free the operating system from the burden of having to understand and support the

needs of individual channels).

13.   As per claim 12, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: a user interface comprising a user

interface object capable of providing a notification of the event received from the communication channel

(Figure 1).

14.   As per claim 13, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: a user interface comprising a user

interface object capable of being activated, wherein the configurable communication server is configured

to send the outgoing communication to the communication channel when the user interface object is

activated (Figure 1)

15.   As per claim 14, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein: the configurable communication server is

configured to send the outgoing communication by issuing the command to the communication channel

(column 4, lines 4-54).

16.   As per claims 15-21, 24-34, and 37-53, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 2 and 5-

14 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.